SPECIAL
COLLECTIONS
DOUGLAS
LIBRARY

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY
AT KINGSTON

KINGSTON ONTARIO CANADA

A SECOND

LETTER

TO THE

Lord Bishop of *Carlisle*,

Lord Almoner to His Majesty,

Upon the Subject of

Bishop *MERKS*;

By Occasion of seizing some

LIBELS,

PARTICULARLY

A Collection of Papers

Written by the Late

R. Reverend *George Hickes*, D.D.

THE SECOND EDITION.

LONDON:
Printed by *Sam. Buckley*, in *Amen-Corner*. 1716.
Price Six Pence.

A Second

LETTER

TO THE

Lord Biſhop of *Carliſle*, &c.

My LORD,

IN the Courſe of a long and uſeful Correſpondence with your Lordſhip, I took the Liberty (in dubious Times) of writing one Letter in Defence of the Proteſtant Succeſſion, upon Occaſion of a great Book or ſort of large Declaration of the Pretender's Right, then publiſh'd with ſome Pomp and Appearance of Authority. What I wrote had the Favour of your Lordſhip's Approbation, for the ſake of the Argument and good Meaning of the Writer; it being intended for a juſt and ſeaſonable Plea, to vindicate our Original *Conſtitution*, and to ſecure the Happy *Settlement* we now enjoy. It was therefore communicated to the World under this Title, *A Letter to the Lord Biſhop of* Carliſle, *concerning one of his Predeceſſors Biſhop* Merks, *on Occaſion of a new Volume for the Pretender, intituled, The Hereditary Right*

of the Crown of England *Asserted. Printed for* Sam. Buckley, *and dated* Octob. 28, 1713. wherein I confest, "That the *Gentleman*, the Author of that "Volume, had indeed expreſt himſelf with the Air "of a Courtier, and all the Appearance of a "Scholar: But the Subject Matter was only to ar-"raign the Nation of Treaſon and Rebellion, and "his late Majeſty King *William* of Uſurpation; "nay, and to abſolve the Queen then reigning, "upon no other Terms, than a good Intention "to reſign the Crown to one called a Right "Heir." He was full of Citations and References to this Purpoſe: But notwithſtanding his Advantages of free Acceſs to the *Tower*, &c. I did ſay, "That no Labourer for a Party was ever "guilty of more Miſtakes, or had given more "wrong Turns to the Matters of Fact and "Law."

Having no Leiſure to go through the Book, I offered at one ſingle Inſtance, as more immediately relating to your Lordſhip and your See of *Carliſle*, the Caſe of Biſhop *Merks*, who having been adjudg'd to Death for Rebelling againſt *Henry* IV. when legally eſtabliſh'd on the Throne, and for Attempting to reſtore King *Richard* II. after his Abdication, and being thereupon deprived of his Biſhoprick, was highly applauded by that Author, or rather the Authors of that Volume, as a noble *Speaker* and *Sufferer* for the Cauſe of *Hereditary Right; a glorious Example of Fidelity and Fortitude*; and all the fine Words which the Papiſts us'd to beſtow upon a *Traitour* when they made him a *Martyr*.

Your Lordſhip was beſt able to judge, whether I did not ſufficiently prove, that whatever was ſaid of Biſhop *Merks* on that Occaſion, was a feigned Story, as to his *Speech*; and as to his Sufferings, the whole was miſtaken in Time, and Place, and Manner, and other Circumſtances of them. So

that

that if by that ſingle Inſtance we might judge of the reſt of that Performance, the *Gentleman* and his Aſſiſtants were not very modeſt, or rather the Subject would not bear Truth and Honeſty.

I remember under thoſe Dangers of the Church I had the Courage to conclude, " I pray, my " Lord, let us not be run down by a noiſy Facti- " on in their open Defiance to the Queen's He- " reditary Right, and to that of Her Proteſtant " Succeſſors, as limited by Law. It is a ſpecial " Providence, that by taking the moſt ſolemn " Oaths our Conſciences depend upon it; nay, " our Eſtabliſh'd Church, the Proteſtant Intereſt " of *Europe*, our Civil Rights and Liberties, the " Well-Being of our Poſterity, every thing that " can be dear to a good Chriſtian and an ho- " neſt *Briton*. Our own Reaſon, our own Con- " ſcience can never fail us: If we ſeek our own " Ruin, it muſt be a Judicial Infatuation up- " on us.

I now gratulate your Lordſhip, that by God's Bleſſing we are eſcaped that *Judicial Infatuation*, when it ſpread more than can be well imagined upon the deluded Minds of the People. I have often thank'd your Lordſhip for that noble Share you had in preſcribing againſt the General Infection, by your conſtant Advices to your Clergy, by your kind Influences on the Nobility and Gentry, and at laſt by taking the Field with them againſt the Rebels, as many of our brave Northern Prelates had done againſt the Incurſion of the *Scots*, and Inſurrection of Rebels, in *Times of Yore*.

One Motive of my Writing to your Lordſhip on that Juncture of contending for *Hereditary Right*, was not ſo fit to be then mentioned: It was, that I had ſome more than ordinary Indignation at the hearing from an Eye-Witneſs, that one of the firſt Preſents of that Volume of *Hereditary Right*, ſplendidly bound, was made to Her Majeſty's own Perſon

Perſon at *Windſor*, by the very *Gentleman* who was ſuppoſed to have the greateſt Hand in it; a *Gentleman* who had not taken the Oaths to Her, and who at that Time would not have gone to the Chapel with Her, and by Principle could never pray for Her. And yet this *Gentleman*, upon and after the Publication of that Book, had frequent Acceſſes to the Royal Cloſet, and by his own Application and Intereſt, obtain'd a haſty Diſcharge of great part of the Penalty inflicted by Law on a Non-juring Divine, for tranſmitting thoſe Papers to the Preſs, and correcting the Sheets, and being found guilty of the Printing and Publiſhing of them.

I ſoon ſaw the Effects of my Writing to your Lordſhip upon that Argument, againſt the Wind and Tide that were then riſing upon the Nation. I had with humble Expectation a plentiful Return of ill Language and ill Uſage for it, which I valued not, as knowing our Cauſe to be good in it ſelf, and by me honeſtly maintain'd. I was threatned with a terrible *Anſwer*, and I know the Man who really took great Pains in ſearching over Hiſtories and Records, to defend the Loyal Character of Biſhop *Merks* from that Account of Rebel and Submitter that I had given of him: But I am ſure the Evidence would not ſerve, and ſo I heard no more of it.

But it ſeems, my Lord, in a late Search for the Perſon and Papers of Mr. *Laurence Howel*, ordained a Prieſt by Dr. *George Hickes*, who bore the Title of a Suffragan Biſhop of *Thetford*, among other notable Diſcoveries, there was one Sheet ſuperſcribed, *A Letter to Dr. Wh. Kennet*: Beginning, *Sir, Your uſual Heat and ill Manners you muſt expect will draw upon you the Pens of honeſt Men, ſo long as you continue them*; and concluding, *To avoid your Malice and the Cenſure of the Adminiſtration, I ſhall uſe ſuch Caution, as to give you no Opportunity of making any Innuendo*;

endo; for I shall confine my self to the Year 1688. *and I promise my self this Satisfaction, that you must either consent with me, or deny the Laws of God and Man, and make all Records and Histories incredible, as if they were your own Penning. I am your faithful Monitor,* A. B.

So, as it seems, this Letter was to be an insulting Dedication of a Book to me: For at the bottom there runs in the same Hand, *The following Pages are an Answer to the Brief History of the Crown of* England, *written at the Time when the Bill of Exclusion was attempted against the Queen's Father, then Duke of* York. Yet the Papers containing that Answer do not follow, but another Postscript, (crossed out with a Pen) *I give you Leave to read over the Remarks I have sent you upon Mr.* Steel's Crisis, *which Book of his I advise you to read with Caution,* &c. Those Remarks are likewise wanting, but there is another prefatory Epistle directed to 'Squire *Steel*, and beginning in a very haughty foolish Way, *Your Motto, 'Squire, is ill apply'd, for you pretend to be unwilling to do Mischief, which you are most naturally fond of;* Parturiunt montes, &c. *had been more proper,* — &c.

By this Taste of the Stile and Temper of the two Letters to Mr. *Steel* and me, your Lordship may infer, that we were great Offenders against their Creature the Pretender, and the Notions that were to set him up; and therefore highly deserved their severest Rebuke and Chastisement of us. And yet they did it (so far at least as in those Epistles, the other Papers I saw not) in an impotent Way of railing and ridiculing; to which I could not have replied, had their intended Works come out at a Time when they were prepar'd, the latter End of the Queen's Reign.

In the Letter to me, (an original Paper signed by the Messengers that seized it,) there is no entring upon the Cause in History or Law; but only ter-

rible

rible Objurgations, *that my Heterodox Preaching and Practiſe had drawn away many People from the Truth of Religious Worſhip in the Church:* By which I hope the Writer underſtands, as I do, that I have kept ſome good People from running into their rebellious Schiſm, wherein they pretend to the only *Truth of Religious* Worſhip. He complains grievouſly, that *I give a vile Character of Biſhop* Merks, *and yet, againſt my Will, I make him ſtrictly faithful to his Rightful Sovereign*, &c. But I ſay, my Lord, not a Word of other Anſwer to the Authorities I had given for his being a Tool in the Hands of an ill Miniſtry, and a weak Prince; that for Ambition and Court-Attendance he was drawn in too far to Retreat; that upon the Acceſſion of King *Henry* IV. this made him firſt a Malecontent, then a buſie Man, and, by Degrees, a Conſpirator, a Traitour, by Law convicted, by the Pope deprived, by the King pardoned. I might add, that this glorious Confeſſor and Sufferer (as they repreſent him) for *Hereditary Right*, did not only ſue, in ſubmiſſive Manner, for the Mercy of that Prince whom he had called an *Uſurper*; but, upon better Thoughts, muſt needs take the Oath of Fidelity to him: For he was afterwards protected, favoured, and even preferred by him.

All which Particulars, not obſerved by the Authors of Hereditary Right, nor enquired after by this Letter-Writer, do certainly make the Circumſtances and Character of Biſhop *Merks* intirely different from what they have drawn for him, to dreſs him up a Champion for their *indefeaſible Right* of Inheritance.

Not a *Biſhop* ſo made for the Merits of Piety and Learning, but a forward *Monk*, thruſt up by King *Richard*, in the worſt Scene of his Adminiſtration, the xxi. of his Reign. Not coming in by *Canonical Election*, but impoſed upon the Prior and Monks by a *Diſpenſing Power* of the King and Pope.

Pope. Not the Man of Honour, and for his Country's Good, but a Creature of the *new Created Lords*, who at that Time of their Promotion were betraying the Kingdom, and ruining the King. Not afterwards the *Man of Conſcience and Integrity*, as they forſooth call him; but ſo far engaged in that abandon'd Party, that he could not timely leave it, having been a Companion of King *Richard* into *Ireland*, and one of the Executors of his laſt Will. Upon the Acceſſion of *Henry* IV. not a Patriot, or a Speech-Maker, as they have invented, but either abſent from that Parliament, or at leaſt a ſilent Spectator in it, as the Nonjuring Biſhops in the Convention 1688-9. Not afterwards a Prelate at *Prayers and Tears*, but actually plotting and riſing in Arms to *murder* the King, and bring about a *French Invaſion*. At his Trial for High Treaſon, not a Pleader of *Loyalty* to King *Richard*, or of *Uſurpation* in King *Henry*; but he inſiſted only upon the Privileges of Exemption of a Popiſh Pontiff, that being an *Anointed Biſhop* he was not obliged to anſwer before the Secular Judges. Nor would he ſtand to ſuffer for that Plea, but when it was over-ruled, he ſubmitted to plead *Not Guilty*, and put himſelf upon his Country, who inquiring upon their Oaths brought him in Guilty. When remanded to the *Tower*, he ſhewed no Inclination to be a Sufferer, and a *glorious Example of Fortitude*, as they extol him; but he caſt himſelf upon the Mercy of his injured Sovereign, and obtained a gracious Pardon, which he *pleaded* in open Court, and entered in to due *Recognizance*, with ſufficient *Sureties* for his good Behaviour. And, after all, a quiet and obedient Subject to King *Henry* IV. and though a Deprived Biſhop, yet the King's Clerk of the King's Patronage in another Eccleſiaſtical Benefice or two, which he enjoyed, for ought we know, to his Life's End.

To us Searchers after the Truth of ancient Matters of Fact and Characters of Men, it is some Provocation to hear the *Leaders of a Party* against a settled Government magnified and set up in high Figures, beyond all Manner of Proportion and Likeness. Upon this false Bottom the few Enemies of our Happy Revolution will be set forth as Patriots and Confessors; and the Assassins of King *William*, and the Rebels against King *George*, will be in the Rank of *Confessors* and *Martyrs*. This was always one of the splendid Frauds in the Church of *Rome*, and by their Artifices too much of late prevailing, has been made very much the Humour of our Common People. Not to mention Dying Speeches, and Funeral Rites, and other idle Stories: Some of our Pulpits have been said to ring of the *Immortal Hickes*; and the Writer of the Letter to me tells me of good Mr. *Lesley*, that *I cannot but know the worth of that good and useful Man, that great Ornament of the CHURCH, and Honour of the NATION.* And he tells me of another whom I have aspers'd, *who is the most accomplished Man living, and Eminent for all Moral Vertues becoming his High Birth*; meaning, I suppose, Mr. *Nelson*, whom I never aspers'd, though I was a Stranger to his *High-Birth*. What *Diptychs* shall we have at last in their Church? What a *Catalogue* of Saints and Martyrs?

This advancing of their Church-Men for being Contenders and Champions against the Powers of Sovereign Princes, is the partial Favour of their Church-Historian, Mr. *Collier*, who all along defends the Prelate against the King; not only in the Case of *Anselm*, but of that greater Incendiary *Thomas Becket*, whose extreme Insolence upon the Breach of his Faith to the King and Lords, he says, *Was, it may be, pushing Matters too far.* But then *as to any Practice against the Crown, he seems innocent enough: And in short, the most exceptionable Parts*

of

of his Conduct, may be said to have been more the Faults of the Age than of the Man. I dare say, my Lord, no one in the World can believe this, but some one who knows no more of *Becket*, than that his Name is in the *Roman* Kalendar. Farther, my Lord, that Ecclesiastical Writer does not only speak smoother Things of Queen *Mary*, the Burner of Hereticks, than he does of our Protestant Queen *Elizabeth*; but he really speaks better of *Gardiner* and *Bonner*, Papal Fox and Butcher, than he does of *Cranmer*, and some other of our glorious Reformers and Martyrs.

Nay, such is the Charity and good Nature, my Lord, of these new Church-Men of the Jacobite Separation, that they will not spare their own dear Brethren, if they offend them, or differ from them any wise in their singular Notions or Practice. I beg Leave to give an Instance or two of this their Brotherly Love from the late *Collection of Papers written by the late R. Reverend* George Hickes, *D. D. 8vo.* 1716. in the Cases of Mr. *Dodwell*, Bishop *Ken*, and Mr. *Kettlewell*, three Persons who, one would think, did as well deserve the good Word of the whole Fraternity, as any Men whatever; and yet severe and strange Accounts are there given of them, not *candid*, and I believe not *true*.

Mr. *Dodwell* was the very Man, who upon the Principle of the *Invalidity of Lay Deprivation* was, in effect, the Author and first Vindicator of their Separation from us; and was more able than any one to fetch it out of the broken State of the Primitive Church, and to draw his wonted Chain of Consequences from such confused Authorities. And yet this learned Man, having some Moderation in him, and not being willing the Schism should *continue* after the decease of the Deprived Bishops, and therefore arguing upon that *Case in View*, and

afterwards upon the same *Case in Fact*, and accordingly conforming his own Practise to it, and returning to the Communion of our Church; Dr. *Hickes* is out of Patience with him: He undertakes to *shew the Weakness of Mr.* Dodwell's *Reasoning in his CASE IN VIEW*, by many like *Cases and Queries*, from p. 237. to p. 242. *as weak* (says he) *as Weakness it self*, p. 247. *an obscure and fallacious way of Reasoning*, p. 252, 258. his Arguments *turn upon himself and in his own Words*, p. 258. *I hope, Sir*, (says he to Mr. *Nelson*) *I have said enough to abate the great Deference you have for Mr.* Dodwell *upon the Account of his great Learning and Piety, and pray you to consider, that if he were freer from Infirmities than he is, and his Authority greater, yet you ought not to follow his Example, when he is not in the Right, and argues so weakly as he has done in his CASE IN VIEW.— Tertullian*, tho' *a greater Man than Mr.* Dodwell, *was himself an Instance of humane Frailty*; and I pray you to *see what VINCENTIUS LIRINENSIS saith of him and ORIGEN, tho' a Prodigy of Piety and Learning, and of many more of the greatest among the Antients, who through humane Infirmities fell into great Errors, and caused great Disturbances in the Church.* Again and again, *I could shew you, that Mr.* Dodwell *in his CASE IN VIEW is contrary to himself in his former Writings, which he wrote in Defence of our Deprived Fathers. But perhaps that will be done by another Hand. You know also how much he is addicted to Nostrums, and how apt he is to raise Doctrines from single Passages out of one or two Fathers, which were never received, taught, or professed by the Catholick Church. You know also what Offence of late he hath given by his Writings to Learned Church-Men of both Communions; and particularly, what Offence he gave to our Deprived Fathers and their Presbyters, by his PARÆNESIS AD EXTEROS; where upon a new and false Hypothesis of his own making,*

making, contrary to the Accounts which all antient Writers give of the first Bishops, (I mean his Hypothesis of the JERUSALEM SUPREMACY) he argues in as weak and precarious a Manner from Devolution of Right, as he doth in his *Case in View; without telling us by what Provision or Direction of Law Ecclesiastical, the Episcopal Right of the last of the* Jerusalem *Bishops of our Lord's Family devolved upon the Presbyters, whom he supposed were Presidents or Protocathedrists of all Churches when that Succession ended.* Again, *there was great want of Law and Logick in Mr.* Dodwell, *to write in such a weak as well as fallacious Manner,* p. 258.

My Lord, I am not going to make an Apology for any of the Singularities of Mr. *Dodwell*; yet whatever was his Narrowness of Spirit, he had greater Charity than Dr. *Hickes*; and of all Men the Doctor should have been the last to speak such angry Things of him. If Mr. *Dodwell* was living when that Letter was written, I believe Mr. *Nelson* was too tender to shew it him: Yet I cannot but wish it had come to Mr. *Dodwell*'s View, while he had been able to give an Answer to it. We all know, that Mr. *Dodwell* was not very patient of Contradiction, and that in any Conference upon such kind of Subjects, he would frequently call for the *vicissitudines loquendi*, his Turns of speaking; and when got in, it was not very easy to interrupt him. To do him Justice, he was very sincere in the Belief of himself and his own Notions, and rather than openly retract them, he would have suffer'd any Persecution. A pervicacious Humour, that the wise King *William* was very sensible of, and would often say to the late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, that Mr. *Dodwell* wanted to be in Prison; but, says his Majesty, *I shall disappoint him.*

But

But Dr. *Hickes*, it seems, had still harder Things to say of Mr. *Dodwell*; for he must mean it of him, when he says, "I take the Freedom to "tell you, that he whose great Example you "follow in this Case, never would say *Amen* to "the Prayers for King *James*; and since his Ma- "jesty's Death said to one of our Brethren, who "will assure you of the Truth of it, that he "thought we ought to pray for the Princess "*Anne* as Queen, because she kept out a Popish "Successor. It would be no Wonder to see such "a Man join the other Assemblies. Now, my Lord, the former Things were peevish and unbrotherly, and I doubt these are very *false*. I had an Opportunity of knowing Mr. *Dodwell* as well as any Man who differed from him; I knew his Manner of Communication in *Oxford* several Years; I lived with him in St. *Edmund Hall* about the Time of the Revolution; and convers'd frequently with him in the Company of the Principal of that House, the learned Dr. *Mills*. And after he was deprived of his *Camden* Professorship, he was my Parishioner at *Shottesbrook* in *Berks*, several Years together; till upon my coming to *Aldermary Church* in *London*, I resigned that other Rectory, not as untenable, but as I was unwilling to keep it. Now in all that long Season of Acquaintance, I could not find out, that *he never would say* Amen *to the Prayers for King* James; I am sure while he was upon the Throne, Mr. *Dodwell* had the most distinguished Principles of Loyalty to him, and was a most constant Resorter to our publick Prayers, and seemed to join in every Petition and Suffrage of them. I dare say for him, that if he could not have said *Amen* to the Prayers for King *James*, he would have then express'd his Dissent from that Part of the Prayers. For it is well known, while he came to Church after the

Revolution,

Revolution, before he had formed his Separation, he would join in all the Prayers, excepting thoſe for King *William* and Queen *Mary*; aud when he came to them, he was not content with a ſilent Suſpence, but he ſufficiently ſhewed his open Abhorrence of them. Indeed after King *James* was in *Ireland*, Mr. *Henry Dodwell* had the leſs Affection for that Royal Perſon; becauſe, poor Man, he found himſelf proſcribed, and his Eſtate forfeited, by Popiſh Intereſt and Power in that Kingdom. But ſtill his Principles of Regal Right and Paſſive Submiſſion were the ſame; and by the profound Reſpect with which he always mentioned that unhappy Prince, I could never ſurmize but that he *prayed* for him, and that in the Daily Offices of the Liturgy among themſelves. That ſince the Death of King *James*, he ſhould be ſo good as to ſay to one of his Brethren, that he *thought we ought to pray for the Princeſs* Anne *as Queen, becauſe ſhe kept out a Popiſh Succeſſor* * is to me incredible, tho' I ſhould be extremely glad to have it granted; for I hope it will be an Argument to ſome of his Admirers to pray for King *George* as King, becauſe he much more effectually keeps out the ſame Popiſh Pretender.

The next Perſon not kindly or juſtly uſed by Dr. *Hickes*, is Biſhop *Ken*, one of his Deprived Fathers, or in his Senſe, of his Collegues and Brethren. A Man of exemplary Piety and Humility, and at firſt of great Charity in the Controverſies ariſing upon the Revolution. His Doubtfulneſs and Fearfulneſs could not be eaſily determined.

---

* Mr. *Brokeſby*, the Author of the Life of Mr. *Dodwell*, who was long Chaplain in thoſe private Families of Mr. *Cherry* and Mr. *Dodwell*, does not hint at any of theſe things; nor Mr. *Hearne*, that I know of.

mined. He own'd in his Letter to the Bishop of "*Sarum*, Octob. 5, 1689. that he had prepared "a *Pastoral Letter* upon the Supposition of alter-"ing his Judgment, and that there might have "been an Inducement to him to comply:" But it seems he burnt his Paper, and adher'd to his former Opinion; but still without censuring others of a contrary Judgment, much less dividing in Communion from them. To his old Friend Dr. *Hooper*, now Lord Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, who had daily and earnestly discours'd him on the Subject of Compliance with the Oath, he at last used these Expressions, — *I question not, but that you, and several others have taken the Oaths with as good a Conscience as my self shall refuse them; and sometimes you have almost perswaded me to comply, by the Arguments you have used; but I beg you to urge them no farther; for should I be perswaded to comply, and after see Reason to repent, you would make me the most miserable Man in the World.* * We have heard, my Lord, of many more Signs and Tokens of Reluctancies and Suspences of Mind in Bishop *Ken*, and of Mr. *Dodwell*'s Correspondence with him, and turning him back in his very way to *London*, when he was going up to submit to the Government. We have the greatest Reason to think it was Anxiety of Thought, a tremulous Conscience, and the Fear of an After-Repentance, that made him chuse (as a mortified Man) the safer Side of Penalty in Ease and Quiet †. And yet he was then somewhat irresolv'd: I believe it will appear, that upon the Queen's Accession to the Throne he had some Thoughts of submitting, to be re-instated in

* A short Account of the Life of Bishop *Ken*, by *W. Hawkins*, Esq; 1713. 8*vo*. p. 33.

† *Ibid.* p. 89.

in his See. And when he could not get over all his Doubts and Scruples, he was again intangled in a new Queſtion of Reſigning or not Reſigning. In ſhort, my Lord, he was not a Man after the Heart of Dr. *Hickes*, and therefore is untowardly uſed by him. I doubt the Biſhop did not approve of the Doctor's Conſecration, and purpoſely abſented from it. The Doctor had heard ſuch an Objection from ſome of the dividing Party. Says he to Mr. *Nelſon*, * *Others take upon you to ſay that the Conſecrations of our Biſhops, and the Power thereby conferred upon them by the Synod of the Deprived Fathers, was not valid for want of the Conſent of Biſhop* Ken. He firſt proves there was no need of that *one particular Perſon, who might have been preſent if he pleaſed, and whoſe poſitive Diſſent goes for nothing.* But then the Doctor adds, " It " is not true that the Conſecrations of our Biſhops " wanted Biſhop *Ken*'s Conſent, which he gave " before in a Letter which he wrote on purpoſe " to the Biſhop of *Ely*, one of the Conſecrators; " and afterwards when he met one of the Con- " ſecrated, gave him his Congratulation in theſe " or the like Words, that tho' he was not " preſent in Perſon at his Conſecration, yet " he was preſent at it in Spirit: And ſince " when ſome of our Communion told him they " were afraid no Proviſion was made for the " Church, he, to give them Satisfaction, aſſur'd " them, that Proviſion was made by new Con- " ſecrations.

If all this be true, I am ſure it is contrary to what the Writer of the Life of Biſhop *Ken*, his Kinſman and Executor, aſſiſted by his Chaplain Dr. *Thomas Cheyney*, has affirmed to us, † *That his*

* A Collection of Papers of Dr. *George Hickes*, p. 226.
† Life of Biſhop *Ken*, p. 26.

Opinion was not agreeable to such of the Nonjurors, who were for continuing a Separation, by private Consecrations among themselves, may (should there be any good Occasion) best be known by his Answers to Letters, written from Men of Learning, who conversed with him on that Subject, and which he left behind him. And indeed had his Lordship any way countenanced such *Consecrations*, as Dr. *Hickes* confesses must be *clandestine* because they are treasonable by our Laws, he would have hardly told the Privy Council in the Beginning of 1696. " * That he had " gone into the Country to his Retirement in " an obscure Village, where he lived above the " Suspicion of giving any the least Umbrage to " the Government.

But that which angred Dr. *Hickes*, was Bishop *Ken*'s deserting of that Cause by a voluntary Resignation of his See. Says the Doctor, *p.* 227. " The strange Humour of resigning took him. I " say the *strange Humour*; First, Because it was not " in his Power so much as to make a Cession " without the Consent of his Collegues, much " less without their Consent to resign to any par- " ticular Person; because by the Nature of the " Episcopal College, as well as the Canons of " the Church, they were to elect and admit into " his vacant See. *Secondly*, Because he pretended " to resign, to heal the Schism in his Dioceſs; " a Reason, which if good, should have obliged " him to have resigned at first, and not to have " kept his Dioceſs Twelve Years or more in " Schism. *Thirdly*, I think it a *strange Humour*, " because he resigned, as much as in him lay, to " one who neither could nor durst own himself " for his next Successor, but is obliged to own himself

* Account of his Examination before the Privy Council, subscribed by his own Hand, *April* 28, 1696.

" himſelf next Succeſſor to the Intruder Dr. *Kid-*
" *der*; and alſo becauſe he reſigns to one with
" whom he does not communicate upon the ac-
" count of the immoral Prayers; whereby the
" Biſhop to whom he reſign'd effectually teaches
" the Flock which he reſigned to him, the dam-
" nable Doctrine of Reſiſtance and Depoſing So-
" vereign Princes, and leads them into a fatal Er-
" ror of taking Right for Wrong, and Wrong for
" Right." So that Biſhop *Ken*, in the Opinion of his Brother *Hickes*, is not only a *Humouriſt*, but a Separatiſt, and a Promoter of Hereſy and Rebellion.

Mr. *Kettlewell* was the third Man I mentioned, who has not met with kind Uſage from his Brethren of the Separation with him. Mr. *Kettlewell* was a very ſerious and auſtere Man, made for a Confeſſor and Sufferer in any Cauſe which he ſhould think to be good. He refuſed the Oaths, and at laſt would not Communicate with thoſe that took them. But he likewiſe falling ſhort in the Perfection of Dr. *Hickes*'s Principles, he is marked out for a ſort of *Heretical Pravity* in him, and ſtands ſtigmatized to be read with caution, like an uncatholick Writer in an expurgatory Index, * " The
" Reader is deſired to take Notice, that in the latter
" End of Mr. *Kettlewell*'s Chriſtian Communion,
" the worthy Author, out of his extraordinary
" Mildneſs and good Nature, has made ſome Al-
" lowances which are not agreeable with the *true*
" *Notion* of Schiſm, or with the *Principles* of Church
" Communion, nor indeed conſiſtent with the o-
" ther Part of his Book.——Therefore let every
" Reader of that Book take Care, that he be not

* A Note added after the Declaration and Profeſſion of the Rev. Mr. *John Kettlewell*, *March* 23, 1694-5. before his Death, *April* 12, 1695. in the ſaid Collection of Papers by Dr. *Hickes*.

" at all biaſſed, either by M. *Kettlewell's* Authori-
" ty, or by any worldly Intereſt."

I have too long detained your Lordſhip with theſe Paſſages of the Differences and Feuds among thoſe Fathers and Brethren, and of the cenſorious and bitter Spirit of Dr. *Hickes* in his Reflections on ſome of them; intending, had I Time, to infer, that when they had ſeparated from us, they were as far from agreeing with one another, or ſpeaking charitably of one another. They loved to call themſelves *the Few*, and the *faithful Few*; and yet were too many to come to any unity of Judgment or Affection; they divided and ſubdivided in their own little Flock, even Paſtor againſt Paſtor: I queſtion whether Dr. *Hickes* had any one of his *Peculium* that could go in entirely to his whole Scheme of the Separation.

And indeed the Principles, my Lord, upon which they formed their Schiſm from the eſtabliſhed Church, were by no Means uniform and common; but almoſt every one of the Builders laid his own diſtinct Foundation. Dr. *Hickes* at firſt upon the *Hereſies* of Reſiſtance and the Depoſing Power brought in at the Revolution. Mr. *Kettlewell* upon the *new Oath*, and *new Allegiance* required upon the Settlement of the Crown. Mr. *Dodwell* upon the Invalidity of Lay Deprivation by Act of Parliament. Others upon the *Immorality of the publick Prayers* for the Powers in Being, whom they thought Uſurpers. And if I underſtood Biſhop *Ken* in a Converſation with his Lordſhip at Mr. *Cherry's*, he put it chiefly upon what he call'd the *Sacrilege of taking away Epiſcopacy in* Scotland *. It was that Multiplicity

* And even Dr. *Hickes* urg'd it as one Argument, that the *Scottiſh Nation* were guilty of a moſt grievous Schiſm, not only againſt their own, but againſt the Catholick Church, &c. Collect. of Papers, *p.* 140.

tiplicity of Notions that made them vary in their Practice: They boasted of six or seven Deprived Bishops; and what if there were four or five such different Ways of Behaviour among them, as could not possibly proceed from the same Principle, or any concerted Measures? Archbishop *Sancroft* went farther toward the Revolution, and was more passive after it, than any of his Brethren. The Bishop of *Chichester*, Dr. *Lake*, upon his Death-Bed declared for the Doctrine of Non-Resistance and Passive Obedience, *Aug.* 27. 1689. but tho' under *Suspension*, and expecting *Deprivation*, he had not yet thought of a *Separation*; he communicated with them who had not then separated from our Congregations; some of them, I think, are living, and some have died in our Communion *. The Bishop of *Glocester*, Dr. *Frampton*, though deprived of his See, was many Years after possessed of a Parochial Cure, wherein if he did not officiate, he generally joined with the People, and when he cared no longer to hold the Living, he obtained it from her Majesty Queen *Anne*, for one whom he recommended to her; though the Grant, I believe, was afterwards revoked by the Courage of Bishop *Fowler*. A fourth of their Fathers took another Turn, the Bishop of *Bath* and *Wells*, Dr. *Ken*, who suffered the Schism during the Life of Bishop *Kidder*, and yet upon the Translation of Bishop *Hooper* resigned to him to heal the Schism. So as we can find but three at most of the seven who lived to be at Harmony with one another, † *in pitching upon* Dr. Hickes

as

* The Declaration of the Bishop of *Chichester* was read and subscribed by him in the Presence of Dr. *Green*, the Parish Minister; Dr. *Hickes*, Dean of *Worcester*; Mr. *Jenkin*, his Lordship's Chaplain; Mr. *Powel*, his Secretary; Mr. *Wilson*, his Amanuensis; who all communicated with him.

† The Publisher to the Reader of the Collection of Papers of Dr. *Hickes*.

at the first Person to be admitted into the Episcopal College; and he was accordingly consecrated by Dr. *Turner*, Dr. *White*, and Dr. *Lloyd*, the deprived Bishops of *Ely*, *Peterborough*, and *Norwich*.

Nay, as their Bishops, so their Clergy and their People were of very *different Sentiments* about what they were to do, or not do, toward continuiug or ending their Separation. When the large Collection of Letters to and from Mr. *Dodwell*, once carefully preserved by Mr. *Cherry*, comes to publick View, that Distraction among them will appear to have been very grievous. Dr. *Hickes*'s Letter to Mr. *Nelson* does sufficiently shew, that it was with them as with the *Donatists* and *Novatians*, and most other of the old Schismaticks; they who first divided had soon a Subdivision made from them, and so were crumbling till they came to Nothing. I think one of the severest Books against Dr. *Hickes*, is that of the *Character of a Primitive Bishop*, written by one whom he then thought to be one of the Faithful, if not one of their separate Communion: I am not willing to transcribe the Character he there gives of Dr. *Hickes*, but I find he knew him perfectly well. Even the *Doctor* himself was not always of one Mind in those Matters: Before his Mock Consecration to *Thetford*, he thought there was no Necessity of any new Consecrations to preserve the Being of their Church; because upon the Death of the last deprived Bishops, there would be a Devolution of Power to the chief Presbyters, who might be a Principle of Unity, till they could hereafter get Bishops to them from some Foreign Church; or as he states his Opinion, with Reference to *Ireland*, "That upon Supposition all the "Protestant Bishops should die in a long Po-"pish Reign, it would be the Duty of the *Irish* "Protestant People to adhere to their faith-"ful Presbyters, who in such a Vacancy would be

"their

" their Spiritual Guides, Guardians, Fathers, Paſ-
" tors, and Principles of Unity to them, till they
" could procure one or more Biſhops, which would
" be their Duty by all Means and Endeavours, to
" do as ſoon as poſſibly they could." * Others again would have had no new Conſecrations in *England*, but would have adhered to the *Iriſh* Biſhop of *Kilmore*, then deprived and reſident in *England*. So Dr. *Hickes* acknowledges, " *Some* of our few
" deſerting Brethren then thought the Biſhop of
" *Kilmore*, as a Catholick Biſhop, qualify'd to keep
" up our Communion, and would not have left
" us if he would have taken the Paſtoral Care of
" us, and been a Principle of Unity to us." But it ſeems he would take no Care of them, and they, poor Man, took as little of him: He was reduced to great Wants before he died; he repreſented his Wants to the late Archbiſhop of *Canterbury*; he complain'd, that his Friends were not kind to him: His Grace ſent him his Bounty from Time to Time, and he was very thankful for being ſo enabled to pay ſome Debts, and to lay in ſome Proviſions.

How divided they were among themſelves does farther appear, from † *A Letter written to the Reverend Dr.* GEORGE HICKES, *containing ſome Objections againſt his Letter to Mr.* NELSON, written by one of that Party, who wants to have ſeveral Things *cleared* up, has this and that Objection, would fain be better *ſatisfied, &c.* And, I ſuppoſe, the *Anſwer* there given would not paſs without a great many more Queries upon it.

Some of them who own'd Reſiſtance to be a *Hereſie*, would not own the Validity of Lay Deprivations

---

* Dr. *Hickes*'s Letter to Mr. *Nelſon* in the Collect. of Papers, *p.* 164.

† *Ibid. p.* 174.

vations to be a *Hereſie*, becauſe indeed it was *never condemned by the ancient Church as a HERESY* (*a*): One would think a good Reaſon to thoſe who were reducing all Things to the exact Standard of the Primitive Church. Yet others maintained it for expreſs and fundamental *Hereſie*; and a third Sort would bring it off with a Diſtinction, that it was not a *Speculative* Hereſie contrary to the *Credenda* of Religion; but yet it was one of the *Practical* Hereſies, as being contrary to the *Agenda* of Religion (*b*). Hence again, ſome were very fond of aſſerting that our Biſhops now in Poſſeſſion of all the Sees in *England*, are *Hereticks*, like as the *Donatiſts* and *Novatians*, were *Hereticks* as well as *Schiſmaticks* (*c*). But others were a little more moderate, and thought our Biſhops, though in the Schiſm, were *not proved guilty of Hereſy* (*d*). Some were more concerned for the *Doctrines*, than for the Schiſm; and ſaid, the deprived Biſhops would have *quitted their Perſonal Rights*, provided they could have ſecured the *Doctrines of Paſſive Obedience, and the Independency of the Church*. Others, or even the ſame Men, ſaid afterwards, "No, the deprived Biſhops could "not have quitted their Perſonal Rights, till the "*Intruders* had confeſſed themſelves invalidly elec- "ted and conſecrated into their Sees (*e*).

Some were abſolutely forbidding their People to come to our Churches, becauſe of our *immoral* Prayers, as they called them, *i. e.* Prayers for King *George*

(*a*) See Collection of Papers, p. 283. I wonder that none of the Primitive Fathers condemned this Sort of Schiſmaticks by the Name of Hereticks, as well as Mr. *Dodwell*, p. 284.

(*b*) Ibid. *p.* 305.

(*c*) Ibid. *p.* 288.

(*d*) *Page* 292.

(*e*) We cannot but take the Revolution Church to be Heretical as well as Schiſmatical, Ib. p. 303.

George and his Royal Family. * Others thought they might *hear* thoſe Prayers read, and yet not *join* in them, and the Duty of *joining* in the *good Prayers*, might oblige them to be *preſent* at thoſe which were *not good*.

But I do confeſs, my Lord, that this laſt Pretenſion of People's coming to our Churches, and yet not joining in ſuch a Part of the Prayers for the King and Prince, *&c.* but expreſſing a Diſſent from them in the midſt of the Congregation, is by no means conſiſtent with the Sincerity of Chriſtians, or with the Nature of joint and publick Worſhip: And whatever ſome of the *Jacobites* themſelves may catch at to excuſe and palliate a cowardly Practice of Rebellion in the Heart and Lips; yet we Clergy-men ought by no means to juſtifie it, or willingly to bear with it. I think, as we are a National Chriſtian Church, our Prayers for *them* who have the Supreme Authority in the Nation, are a Scriptural Canon to us, 1 *Tim.* 2. 12. *for Kings and all that are in Authority.* I think, if any Perſon had come into any Aſſembly of Chriſtians in that Age of the Apoſtles, and refus'd to join in that part of the *Supplications and Prayers*, he would have been caſt out as a Deſpiſer of the *Dominions* and *Dignities* in Being: Or if he had quibbled and ſaid, he could not pray for the Emperour, becauſe he was an Uſurper, a Tyrant, or any other odious Name, ſhould this Plea have cover'd his Diſſent from the reſt of the Congregation? Should he be allow'd to mean *one* Emperour, when the Miniſter following the Eſtabliſhment meant and nam'd *another*? If there were Competitors for the Empire, were

D the

* Dr. *George Hickes* calls them Prayers *execrable in their Nature, polluting Chriſtian Offices*, &c. in his Letter to Mr. *Nelſon*, p. 176, 177, *&c.*

† The Anſwer to Dr. *Hickes*, p. 285.

the Christian Church of Bishops and Presbyters to decide the Titles of them? If one were a *Possessor*, and another a *Pretender* to Right, did any Christians espouse the latter, or concern themselves about him? Did not the Primitive Fathers boast of this Principle and Practise upon it, that they prayed for the Emperous upon the Throne, and were never called by the Name of any opposite Faction?

And therefore I can by no means approve of the Distinction of an *Intentional* and *Final* Imposition of a thing commanded: Any Command of lawful Authority, given by sufficient Declaration of it, is no longer an *Intentional* but a *Final* Imposition to all Intents and Purposes, till it is revok'd by the same Authority. It would be of the most pernicious Consequence to apply that Distinction to expres Orders and publick Acts of Authority, that Subjects might wave their Obedience to them, till they saw whether their Governours would finally *insist* upon them, and whether they would really inflict the Penalties they had before threatned and *intended*. How shall we know that any Act of Parliament, or any Canon, is of any Force and Vertue upon the first promulging of it? How shall we have any Free-will Obedience, if it must be *finally* extorted? Must not Subjects think their Law-givers in earnest, till they feel the Terrours of the Law? I am hinting only for want of room to argue; but I presume some body will shew the Fallacy and the ill Consequences of this Distinction.

If your Lordship should ask, how then I would argue with those disaffected People, that come to our Publick Congregations, and yet shew an open Aversion to the Prayers for King *George*. I must needs say, I would not lend them a Distinction to palliate and prolong that Practice, which is in it self a Schism *in* the Church, and may be a greater Scandal

dal than a Separation *from* it. But I would labour to convince them, that in the first Churches planted by the Apostles of Christ, their stated Prayers for Kings, and All in Authority, were expressly injoin'd by Scripture, and were a Term of Communion in every Church: And had any private Christians then pleaded, that they could not in Conscience join in such Prayers and Supplications for this or that Chief Governour, because they questioned or denied his Title of Election, Succession, Adoption, or whatever was the common Title of Princes; and that their Words or Meaning should be in the midst of the Congregation to pray, differently from the Minister and People, for another Imperial Head, whom they thought to have a better Right against the Possessor: Such private Christians would not have been suffered in any Religious Assembly, but would have been thought guilty of breaking the Unity of the Spirit, and the Bond of Peace, in the Face of God and the Congregation.—I would prove to them, that the same Rule and Practice of one Mind and of one Voice, obtained in all the Primitive Churches, in their Publick Assemblies, they acknowledged the Civil Governours in Being, and pray'd for them; and if any Person then present had openly dissented from those Prayers, he would have been censured as a Schismatick and Divider of the Church.—I would tell them, that the same Catholick Conformity prevailed in this Church and Nation of *England*, from the Conquest to the Revolution, the Kings upon the Throne had the publick Suffrages of the Priest and People: And tho' Titles were continually disputed, and the Princes who recovered an older Right of Inheritance would call their Predecessors Kings *de facto*, not *de jure*; yet it was all one in the Prayers of the Church, no one Scruple that we read of, in Praying as required for the King in Being, whether they

thought him an Uſurper, or whether they pleaſed to call him the Right Heir.—In ſhort, I would ſhew it was ſo amongſt the Papiſts themſelves in the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*, while they came to our Churches, for about the firſt ten Years of her Reign: They denied her Birth-right *, and moſt of them had their Eyes on a Pretender of their own Religion; and yet they joined, for ought we hear, in the Publick Prayers for the Queen, which were in moſt Parts of the Liturgy, as full and expreſs as they now are for King *GEORGE*. And it was not on that Foot of ſuſpending and refuſing their Prayers for the Queen, that they ſoon after entirely ſeparated from us.—I would proceed therefore to ſatisfie them, that the Queſtion of Right and Title in a legal Settlement ought not to be the Matter of Diſpute and Diſſenſion in the Publick Prayers of the Church, eſpecially among the People in following the Miniſter, and begging God's Bleſſing on the Powers that protect them.—Though, after all this arguing, I would undertake to prove to them, that our preſent Sovereign King *GEORGE* had really and effectually the Beſt Title that *Engliſh* King or Queen ever had: The neareſt Proximity of Blood capable to defend a Proteſtant Church and Nation: The Call and Deſignation and repeated Acknowledgments of the whole Legiſlature in ſeveral ſucceſſive Parliaments before his Acceſſion to the Crown: His Wiſdom, Juſtice, Clemency, and other Royal Vertues, that make him anſwer the End of all Government, the being a Miniſter of God for apparent common Good: And the ſingular

---

* Pope *Paul* IV. had told the *Engliſh* Embaſſadour Sir *Edward Kairn*, upon the Death of Queen *Mary*, that *Elizabeth* could not ſucceed, being Illegitimate. See Sir *R. Twiſden*'s Vindication, *p.* 126.

gular Providence of God in ſecuring his Right and Poſſeſſion againſt all his Enemies, and bleſſing him with a daily Increaſe of Intereſt and Honour, in the Eyes of his good People, and even in the Sight of all *Europe*.——But truly, my Lord, after I had ſaid thus much, and what might occaſionally offer upon theſe Hints, if they ſtill adhered to their Prejudice, and would tell me that they could not in Conſcience pray for King *GEORGE*, I would deſire them to conſider better; and if after ſome Conſideration they ſhould ſtill perſevere in it, I would deſire them to ſtay at Home, rather than give a Publick Offence; and if notwithſtanding they would come to my Church, and openly diſſent from thoſe Prayers, I would again admoniſh them, and upon their Contempt I would refuſe to give the Holy Sacrament to them, till they were in more Charity with the Government, and with me and their Neighbours: And according to their following Behaviour, I would farther proceed with them.

There is another *Diſtinction* likewiſe framed, that is not ſo right in it ſelf, nor will it convince the new Schiſmaticks to whom it condeſcends; namely, the *wide Difference between the Schiſm of Co-ordination, and the Schiſm of Subordination*; and that Dr. *Compton*, the Biſhop of *London*'s Acknowledgment of Intruders into neighbouring Sees, was but a *Schiſm of Co-ordination* in reſpect to thoſe his equal Collegues, and could not juſtifie a *Schiſm of Subordination*, which muſt have followed, if the Clergy and People of *London* Dioceſs had thereupon ſeparated from Biſhop *Compton*, or his preſent Succeſſor.

Now, my Lord, I do not think that Biſhop *Compton* was guilty of any Manner of *Schiſm*, but if he were, he muſt be guilty of a Schiſm of *Subordination*, and not of *Co-ordination* only. No, ſays the

the Distinguisher, *I need not observe to the Non-Jurors, that all Bishops are of the same Order and Dignity.* Yes, but they tell us again, that tho' one Bishop is not subordinate to another *single* Bishop, yet he is still subordinate to the *College of Bishops*; which *true College* were the deprived Bishops; and that Bishop *Compton* broke that Unity and Order to which he ought to have been subject. Nay, and they tell us, that by our Constitution, which had prevailed likewise very early in the Primitive Church, Bishop *Compton* was in a *Provincial* Capacity as well as in a *Diocesan*, subordinate as a Suffragan to Archbishop *Sancroft*; and that he broke through that *Subordination*, even by a breach of his Oath of Canonical Obedience to his Primate and Metropolitan; and farther still by assisting and presiding in the Consecration of a new Archbishop, Usurper and Intruder, as they call him: Which certainly makes the Distinction in that Case to be put into the Mouths of the Jacobites, rather than to be taken from 'em. I have, my self, heard them complain of Bishop *Compton* as the Ring-leader of the Schism. †

And therefore Dr. *Hickes* is upon a consistent Hypothesis (were the Foundation of it true) that will by no Means admit of any such refined Distinction. He says plainly, and we can understand him, that "the true Church Regent is the College of "Bishops in *England*. And that as in every *Diocess* "the Church is in the rightful Bishop, who is the "Principle of Unity in it, and his Flock, though "never so small in Number: So in every *Province*, "the Episcopal College is in the rightful Primate "or

† Collection of Papers, *p.* 103.

So the *Case of Schism*, p. 5. cries out, they not only displaced the Canonical Metropolitan Archbishop *Sancroft*, but hoisted up a Subject Presbyter of his, Dr. *Tillotson*, into his Room, who had sworn Canonical Obedience to him.

" or Preſident of it, and thoſe Biſhops and their " Flocks who adhere to him as the Principle of " Unity therein." And he does abundantly imply, nay affirm, that Biſhop *Compton*, by leaving his Primate and conſecrating another into that Metropolitan See, was a Principal in the guilt of the *Schiſm of Subordination*. For, ſpeaking of thoſe who filled up the Sees of the deprived Biſhops, ſays he, " their Electors and Conſecrators are *Auc-* " *tores & Duces Schiſmatis*, Authors and Architects " of the Schiſm, and in the ſame Degree of Guilt " with them that are Breakers of the ſacred Or- " der of Co-ordination and SUBORDINA- " TION." * Again, in the *Anſwer* ordered by Dr. *Hickes*, " None of the deprived Biſhops Sees " were really vacant, no Perſon was nominated " to them by the KING (*i. e.* King *James*) nor " were the Intruders conſecrated by the Metro- " politan (Archbiſhop *Sancroft*) but without, nay " againſt his Conſent, though he was ſtill living, " and their lawful Primate." †

To do Dr. *Hickes* juſtice, as he is extremely Rigid in the utmoſt Bounds of an extravagant Cauſe, ſo he is uniform and ſteady in it; and by what he writes, it is plain and evident what he means, which cannot be ſaid of Mr. *Dodwell*, nor, I think, of any other of their Writers in that Controverſie.

Theſe things, my Lord, might be repreſented more at large, and I think if we muſt bring the *Argumenta ad Hominem*, adapt our Arguments to the Prejudice of thoſe People, by gracious Conceſſions to them (a way that ſeldom prevails) this would be a fair way of expoſtulating with them, Why they

* Collection of Papers, *p.* 97, 96.
† Ib. *p.* 314.

they keep up a Schism that their Leaders could not agree upon? And why do they boast of the Union of a true Church, when so many were the Windings and Turnings of the Guides in that way? Why must we suffer for the Spiritual Rights of those deprived Bishops, who after their Deprivation never exerted those Spiritual Rights? Why after those Bishops are dead and gone, must we adhere to their pretended Successors, when they dare not tell us how they became Successors to them? This honest way, if any thing, might serve to convince their Followers, that they can hardly be in a right way, since they know not whence they come, or whither they are going. They may, for a short Time, agree as a *Political Faction*; but as a *Spiritual Society*, they were at first, and must be ever in Confusion.

I beg your Lordship's Pardon, and fall back from this Digression, to return to the *MS* Letter found among the Papers of Mr. *Howel*. There is one other Passage that deserves some Notice in Justice to the World, and to the Memory of those Great Men, who encouraged Mr. *Rymer* to collect and publish those fifteen Volumes of *Publick Acts*, which (however deficient and short of the first Proposal) are the best Monument of the past Glories of a Nation, that ever yet appear'd since the Beginning of Nations. In my former to your Lordship, I had referred to the best Authorities as they stood there transcribed from the Records; and for this the Epistoler rebukes me in these Words; *I must take leave to tell you, that had you acted the part of a faithful Traditor, you ought to have looked into those Volumes of Records collected by Mr.* Rymer, *(I think eight or nine in Number,) but unprinted, (for what Reason any honest Man may guess that considers at what Time they were collected,) in which are contained the most material, relating to Church-Persons, and Affairs, and not to have excerp'd*

excerp'd Citations from an adverſe Party only, who were not likely to ſpeak any thing in favour of a Loyal Subject in thoſe Times of Murder and Rebellion.

My Blood was a little quick at this Paragraph. Surely, thought I, if the Writer could not ſpare the *Times*, nor the *adverſe Party*, yet he might have ſpared Mr. *Tho. Rymer*, and not have made the honeſt Man ſuch a Tool, as to pick out the Inſtruments that made for the preſent Civil Government to be publiſh'd, while he ſuppreſs'd the moſt material relating to the Intereſt of the Church and Clergy.

Your Lordſhip has had great Opportunities to know the Truth of that Matter; and I think you can better relate it to this effect, that in the happy and victorious Part of the Queen's Reign, ſome of the Prime Miniſters, eſpecially the Lords *Somers and Hallifax*, aſſiſted by the Biſhops of *Canterbury*, *Sarum*, and *Nowich*, (nor was your Lordſhip wanting) did conſult of a better way to preſerve the Records in the Tower, did move it in the Houſe of Peers, and had a ſtanding Committee appointed for it, who from Time to Time came to ſeveral Reſolutions for ſearching out and digeſting the Original Rolls and Papers, for providing and framing a better Repoſitory for them, for committing them to a ſafer Cuſtody, and for ſecuring an eaſier Acceſs to them. It was under the Influences of this Publick Spirit, that it was thought it would be a Benefit and Credit to the Nation, to print and publiſh a Collection (in order of Time) of Authentick Copies of the Original Inſtruments, more eſpecially relating to Peace and War, Treaties, Articles, and other Intercourſe with Foreign States and Princes. Mr. *Rymer*, as Hiſtoriographer Royal, was appointed to collect them, and Mr. *Churchill* to print them, upon the Publick Account, and (which was Pity) in too ſmall a Number of Copies, for Preſents on-

ly and publick Reſpects, not for common Sale. Mr. *Rymer* was obliged to truſt other Hands, not only in the tranſcribing, but in the ſelecting of Materials for them. When he came to review them in the ſingle Sheets, he threw by ſeveral of them, as not ſo directly pertinent to the main Deſign. But whatever Papers were thus caſt by, it was, I dare ſay, without any Inſtruction from the Miniſters of State, and without any Political Views within himſelf; it was only to omit what did not ſo directly anſwer his profeſſed Title of *Fœdera, Conventiones, Literæ, & cujuſcunque generis Acta Publica inter Reges Angliæ & alios quoſvis Imperatores, Reges*, &c. However the Copies thus omitted were not ſunk or deſtroy'd, but committed to the Bookſeller, in whoſe Hands they now remain (tho' not *in eight or nine Volumes*, as the Writer to me multiplies them in a Dream) and a Sight and Uſe of them was communicated to the late Lord Biſhop of *Sarum*, toward compiling a *third Part of his Hiſtory of the Reformation*, wherein he refers to theſe Manuſcripts of *Rymer*. Many of thoſe Papers did concern the Popes and Court of *Rome*, and the State of Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, in Complaints, Appeals, Delegations, Decrees, and a thouſand Arts of creating Church Controverſies, and prolonging the Dependence of them. Theſe therefore, as Trumpery, were thrown by, as not tending to the great End of Leagues and Treaties; and, to ſave unneceſſary Expences, were kept unprinted; not upon any View of the *Times*, or any *Trick* of an *adverſe Party*, as that Writer has ſurmiſed with no Manner of Charity or Truth.

I appeal to your Lordſhip, that Mr. *Rymer* was ſo far from an artful Collector, that he was too Supine and Careleſs of what was done in that Work, and hardly deſerved his Name to be aſcribed to it. For though in his firſt Volume, 1704, he did vouchſafe

vouchsafe to give the Reader some Account of what the old Historians had observed under the respective Years concurrent with the fuller Testimonies now given of them, * and did promise to be more large in his following *Tomes*: Yet in the very next he was content with an *English Dedication* to the Queen, without any such promised regard to the Reader, either in that or any other of the xv *Tomes*, published before his Death. Which makes the xvi*th Tome*, published by Mr. *Sanderson*, as valuable as any of the former. I am afraid Mr. *Rymer* did not always collate the Transcripts with the *Autographa*, or did not afterwards revise the Sheets from the Press; for your Lordship well knows there be many Escapes and Mistakes in the Print, especially in the Names of Persons and Places, obvious to most Men acquainted with the History of those Times.

One Suggestion, my Lord, may from hence arise, that since a Suspicion is raised of foul Praccise in not printing all and singular the Copies transcribed for Mr. *Rymer*, it would well become the Spirit of the Present Ministry, to order all those omitted Papers to be put into one or two Supplemental *Volumes*; not only to vindicate their noble Predecessors, and to silence that late Clamour of unreasonable Men, but to enrich the Republick of Letters, and to gratifie the Lovers of Antiquity, the Friends of their King and Country.

There is, I confess, a better Method of saving that Trouble and Expence, but then it is by a much greater; and I will mention it, because I think no Attempt is too great for the Genius of the present Court, when Peace and Commerce

* *Plurima hujusmodi ubilibet pullulantia videat curiosus Lector, sed quamplurima hujusmodi, & jam nunc detenta dolet, in aliud tempus expectanda differimus.*

ſhall have their full Settlement. It is, my Lord, to give a new *Edition* of all thoſe Collections in a leſs Bulk, by a ſmaller Letter and fewer Breaches, and throwing out ſome Duplicates: To interſert the omitted Papers as they fall into the Series of Time; to add any other Copies of original Deeds and Evidences, of which there be Thouſands ſtill remaining of the like Importance; and then to collate and ſuperviſe with that Diligence and Accuracy that are due to the publick Faith and Honour. And I have another Wiſh at leaſt, to employ one or two able Hands for the running along an *Hiſtorical Thread* with every Inſtrument, ſhewing the Occaſion, Connexion, Dependence, with the chief Uſe and Application of them; namely, how ſuch and ſuch Errors in the common Hiſtorians may be well corrected, ſuch Defects and Omiſſions ſupplied; ſuch Contradictions reconciled; ſuch Traditions condemned; ſuch Pretenſions confounded; and a new Light given for better Diſcoveries in the dark Places of every Age. Some ſuch Improvement of the Work, by the Pains of an able Editor, and the Support of a bountiful Prince, may, I hope, come to be one of the growing Glories of this Reign. The rather becauſe the Uſe of thoſe Volumes is now found ſo neceſſary Abroad, for the tranſacting of our Publick Affairs, that His Majeſty within His Dominions in *Germany*, had a late Occaſion to enquire for them, and could not have been ſupplied with them at any Mart in *Europe*, nor indeed at any Place of Sale in *Great Britain*, had not the worthy Comptroller ſignified ſo much to a noble Peer in *England*, who by the next Return preſented His Majeſty with his own Sett of them, curiouſly bound.

There is but one Objection againſt what I propoſe, and that is the Charge of it; an Objection too mean to be made by a *Government* that will ever think

think of that Charge. I remember a Story of the laſt Duke of *Buckingham*, who was projecting ſome extravagant Work at *Clevedon*, and adviſed about it with a Gentleman coming to viſit him, Sir *R. G.* who, when he had heard the mighty Scheme and the Extent of it, anſwer'd, *This would be very glorious, my Lord Duke; I have but one Objection, it will coſt a prodigious Sum of Money.* The Duke look'd upon him with great Contempt, and ſaid —— *Who would adviſe with ſuch a narrow ſoul'd Fellow!*

This literary Project was not indeed thought of in a late Juncture, when they talk'd of *cultivating the Arts of Peace.* The Records of the *Tower* were then ſearch'd, I doubt for a leſs honeſt Political Purpoſe. The two Perſons, or their Undertakers, who had the eaſieſt Acceſs to the Rolls, to the Paper Office, and to the Libraries of Publick Miniſters, were the two Authors of *An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of* Great Britain, *chiefly of* England, in two Volumes, *Fol.* and *Of the Hereditary Right of the Crown of* England *aſſerted, by a Gentleman*, Fol *. The two Performances, that I think of all others were calculated to ſoften Popery, and bring in Tyranny of Church and Crown; and are therefore managed in a Way ſuitable to thoſe Deſigns, with the utmoſt Air of Authority, and yet with the utmoſt Prejudice and Party-Study; as in my former Letter I gave your Lordſhip a little Specimen, and ſhall confirm it by abundant Proofs, when I come to give a Supplement to the Life and Death of Biſhop *Merks*, which for Truth and Juſtice ſake I ſhall do at the next Opportunity.

The moſt accurate Writers in Hiſtory may have their Mis-information and Miſtakes upon it; and the Apology then is, that they had ſome Authority

* 1 Vol. 1708. 11 Vol. 1714. Fol. 1713.

ty for what is said; and that they fairly reported, without Respect of Persons, or contending Parties. But when Men engage in a particular Cause of Self-Interest, or Humour, and set themselves against the Generality of Mankind, and then pick up Stories that may serve their own Side, and expose what they call the adverse Party: This is a Violence to be abhorr'd in a free Nation.

I have already intimated, my Lord, that it is above all for this Reason I uttterly dislike the late *Collection of Papers written by Dr.* George Hickes. I am shock'd at his distorted Use of Holy Scriptures, his fanciful Inventions about the Nature and State of the first Evangelical Churches; his insisting absolutely on the Testimonies of Fathers in Matters of Discipline and outward Practice, wherein they must needs run backward and forward, as the Course of Times and Constitution of Countries might require; his exalted Notions of the *Kingdom of the Church*, the *Thrones of Royal Priests, Vicegerents* of the eternal *Melchisedeck, Spiritual Principalities*, and other assumed Titles of Sovereignty, beyond Popery, beyond any Enthusiasm but that of the *fifth Monarchy Men*, who were setting up King *Jesus* upon Earth; his arraigning our whole Constitution, Ecclesiastical and Civil, as upon a wrong Bottom from the very first Foundations of it, upon *many false Maxims extremely hurtful to the Church, and detrimental to the Christian Religion, received for Law and Truth* *; as, "that Tythes and Offerings may "become a Lay Fee; that Patronage, or the Right "of presenting Clerks to Cures, is a Lay Fee; "that the King is Supreme Ordinary;— and par- "ticularly, the Unchristian Acts of Parliament "touching the Election and Consecration of "Bishops,

* Collection of Papers, *p.* 75, &c.

" Bishops, and the like, which he is able to shew " have been the *Natural*, as well as *Judicial*, Causes " of all the Miseries in Church and State among " us for many Years †. His Painting our Reformation blacker than *Sanders* and the Jesuits could ever represent it, and making a Separation or Schism from it necessary upon those Principles, as much at the Beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*, as at the Beginning of King *William*. His Modelling *such* an Independent Church, and yet making the Christian Magistrate so much depending on it, that no Christian Prince or State would protect such a Church; or if they did, they must be in a worse Condition, as to Temporals, than the Heathen Emperours were, in and after the Apostles Time. His bringing the Clergy of our Church into the utmost Contempt and Incapacity; they can perform no *valid Acts of Priesthood, their very Prayers are Sin, their Sacraments are no Sacraments, their Absolutions are null and of no force, God ratifies nothing in Heaven which they do in his Name upon Earth, they and all that adhere to them are out of the Church, they can claim no Benefits of God's Promises; no, not of his assisting Grace, nor of Remission of Sins through the Merits of Christ's Blood. Nay, though they should dye Martyrs in the Schism, their Martyrdom would not be accepted; if they could dye Martyrs more than once, they could not make amends for their Sin with their Blood* *. We have seen, my Lord, many terrible Forms of solemn Cursing in the Church of *Rome*, but never any Thunder like this, never any striking so deep to the Pit of Hell. His shewing many other Instances of his Good-Will to us of the inferiour Clergy; one Instance especially that we cannot approve, his shutting

† Ib. *p.* 28, 29. 85. 145. 314.

* Collection of Papers, *p.* 32, 33. and in many other Places.

ſhutting us all out of the Convocation-Houſe; for *we have forgot, it ſeems, what a perfect Synod is,* which is a *Synod of the Provincial Biſhops, or the Majority of them under the Metropolitan, in which he is perſonally, or by Proxy preſent:* Such a Synod only †. So that we have been diſputing about the Privileges of our Houſe to a fair Purpoſe, when, as ſoon as the Church was out of Danger, we were all to be turned out of Doors. He has a great many other Poſitions and Conſequences, that all the Lovers of Truth and Charity muſt think to be abſurd and dreadful. But I ſay at preſent, my Lord, I had more Mind to take Notice of his Licentiouſneſs in Matters of Fact, and his Story-Relations ſo bitterly delivered and applied, that there is no Belief of them.

I have given ſome Inſtances of his dealing with his old Friends, when they did but in the leaſt diſoblige him; what were his Enemies to expect? Let me point at one Inſtance that will not long detain your Lordſhip; it lies within the Compaſs of one half Page 235. the loading of ſix or ſeven particular Perſons with a great deal of Reproach, among them an Archbiſhop, two Biſhops, beſides the Body of the *London* Clergy; and all this in three little Stories, that I dare ſay are none of them ingenuous and true.

Speaking of a ſinful Latitude and Comprehenſion, by which we leave the People to believe and profeſs what they pleaſe, provided they will help to fill our Churches, and make a Shew and Appearance of Communion, he tells his Tales, " Thus " Mr. *Firmin*, that notorious *Arian* and *Macedonian*, " was a great Favourite of the Biſhop and Clergy " of *London*, but more eſpecially of Dr. *Tillotſon*, and " was allowed, while he lived, to come to Church " and

† Collection of Papers, *p.* 226. So before, *p.* 103. the true Church Regent is the College of Biſhops in *England*, &c.

" and ſit down at the *Gloria Patri*, to teſtify his " Diſſent to the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, as " you intend to ſtand up at the immoral Prayers, " to teſtify your Diſſent to them. Thus Mr. *Bax-* " *ter* was allowed to come not only to Church, but " to the Altar: And thus Biſhop *Lloyd*, then Biſhop " of St. *Aſaph*, adminiſtred the Holy Euchariſt to " Dr. *Bates* ſitting in a Pew, at the Time of the " Revolution *.

Now I doubt every one of theſe Stories is ſomewhat like a Popiſh Legend, whatever Truth it firſt had in the Original Occaſion of it, yet that little Truth is ſo blended, vampt up, and wrought upon, that it is all a new thing. As to Mr. *Firmin*, I think he ſhould not be call'd a notorious *Arian* and *Macedonian*: He did not borrow his Hereſies from any of the old Hereſiarchs, nor did he ſearch back into antient Writings. He was Pupil indeed to a ſort of *Macedonian* (yet more than he knew) Mr. *John Biddle*, and waited upon *Cromwell* to get his Releaſe from *Newgate*, and uſed often to tell of the Reprimand he met with from his Highneſs. However, I think Mr. *Firmin* took his Notions rather from the Modern *Socinian* Writers, and if he delighted in any Name it was in that of *Unitarian*. Whatever he was, he was not a Favourite of the Biſhop and Clergy of *London*, nor of Dr. *Tillotſon*, upon any account of Doctrine or Tenet; but merely as he was an active and publick-ſpirited Man, a very uſeful Citizen, of great Acquaintance and Intereſt, and very much intruſted with the receiving and diſpoſing of Money for pious and charitable Uſes; and for theſe good Works he would have been a *greater Favourite* with the Biſhops and Clergy, if he had not been tainted with ſingular Opinions; for

* Collection of Papers, *p.* 235.

which Dr. *Tillotſon*, in his meek way, would often reprove him. How therefore can Dr. *Hickes* ſay, He was ALLOWED to come to Church and ſit down at the *Gloria Patri*? Was there any profeſſed, or ſo much as intimated *Allowance* given by any manner of Authority, down from the Biſhop to the Church-Warden? Nay, I dare ſay Mr. *Firmin* did not *allow himſelf* in any conſtant viſible Practice of it: For I have heard he came ſeldom or never to the Prayers of the Church; he came only to hear Sermons, and at the end of them he would commonly go out before the Bleſſing, rather than ſtay to ſhew any open Diſſent from it, as given in the Name of the Holy Trinity.

Then as to Mr. *Baxter*, why ſo much Streſs upon his being ALLOWED to come not only to Church, but to the Altar. By the *Altar*, I ſuppoſe, he means the Communion, not the Table; and that he received as other Lay Communicants did, kneeling and ſubmitting to the publick Form and Manner in the Church of *England*: Which I think was no Reproach to him or to the Church. Such Charity of Communion, even of Occaſional Communion, if it be of Catholick Love, not for Secular Ends, will ſooneſt tend to the healing of our unhappy Diviſions.

The laſt Story is more partial than the other two: That Biſhop *Lloyd*, then Biſhop of St. *Aſaph*, ſhould adminiſter the Holy Euchariſt to Dr. *Bates* SITTING in a PEW, was very *needleſs* when Dr. *Bates* made no Scruple of *Kneeling* (while poſſibly able to kneel) whenever he was (as very often) a Communicant in any of our Pariſh Churches. And it was improbable to be ſitting in a PEW, becauſe (as I have heard) Biſhop *Lloyd* was the very Man who had reform'd that Cuſtom of adminiſtring within *Pews* in his Church, and brought all his People to draw near to the Communion-Table.

Table. In Truth, Bishop *Lloyd*, while Minister of St. *Martins*, was not a Man given to break Rules and Orders of the Church, as some higher Folks have been more apt to do; he was rather so strict, that Mr. *Baxter* and his Friends complained of him as a hard Man. But why this to be at the Time of the *Revolution*? Bishop *Lloyd* was not Minister of St. *Martins*, or of any Church in or near *London* at *that* Time, nor for some Years before. It is well known, that as Dr. *Bates* went in the Mornings to his own Parish Church of *Hackney*, while there residing; so when he was in *London*, he went usually to Dr. *Beveridge*'s Church, and communicated there; and your Lordship will say, that of all City Divines Dr. *Beveridge* was the least likely to abate of any stated Rite and Ceremony. What must be the Men that in their Anger can tell such Stories? And what must be the Cause that requires them?

I have but one Observation more to make to your Lordship, which is, that in other Schisms and Divisions we might hope for some end of them, without a Necessity of submitting to such Conditions as *that* of Unchurching the Establish'd Church of *England*, and *that* likewise of transferring the Crown to another Head and Family: But these two are the express Conditions, the very Preliminaries insisted on by these Jacobite Schismaticks, before they can treat with us; we must agree with them in the first place to the turning out all our Archbishops and Bishops, and if they could hope to be restored, it must be *effectually done when Time serves, by their desiring or accepting from the Crown new Nominations to their Bishopricks*, * i. e. from the *Crown* when placed on what they think the Right Head.

* Collect. of Papers, *p.* 178.

And yet not to have those *new Nominations, till they have condemned the Doctrines of Resistance and Lay Deprivation; and likewise shall confess themselves to have been guilty of Schism, and have done something to testify their Repentance* *. We must also agree to the dethroning of the best of Princes. Dr. *Hickes* is full enough of his Acknowledgments of *another King*, and that he was himself made a Bishop by some *other King's Consent; the Consent of him who desired the Continuance of that Church of* England *which was in Communion with them* †. And therefore rather than pray for his present Majesty King *George*, he would be of his other King's Religion. He should think it *less heinous to be present at Divine Offices where* Ave Maria's, *&c. are said* *. *Nay, for his own Part, he had rather as a Priest,* say Prayers in a Congregation to Saints and Angels, which is only forbid by a Positive Law, than these Prayers, by which (says he) My K I N G is abused, abjured, cursed, and the righteous King of Kings most horribly blasphem'd.

Good God! But see, my Lord, this Schism is nothing but a Political Faction arising out of the deadly Feud, an Abhorrence of the Revolution, and the Protestant Succession, and King *George* upon the Throne of His Ancestors. They are a spiritual Army for the Pretender, to take up carnal Weapons when they can. I lament their Misfortune, and would do any Thing honest for their Reconciliation. But this I take for granted, that we can never possibly *reconcile* them to our Church, till we have reconciled them to King *GEORGE* and his Protestant Royal Family.

How

---

* Collect. of Prayers, *p.* 292.
† *Ibid.* p. 171.
* *Ibid.* p. 8.

How far your Lordſhips in the next Seſſion may attempt to reconcile them, is a Thing belonging to the Wiſe, I offer not to meddle with it. But this I remember, that *Schiſms* in the Church have been effectually cured by the State; eſpecially the ſetting up one Epiſcopal Chair againſt another, though done by the Pretenders to Infallibility on both Sides, has been roundly determined by the Supreme Civil Powers in this Nation, who have thought it ſufficient to declare to the Clergy and People, which Side was right, and which was wrong; what Pope or Spiritual Father to be received as natural and true, and what to be diſclaim'd as an Anti-Pope and Schiſmatical Pretender. This Authority over the higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Perſons in a Cauſe of the moſt Canonical and Spiritual kind, was (as often as Occaſion ſerved) claimed and exerted by the Civil Sovereignty, within this Kingdom, no Matter whether by the King alone, or by the King and his Supreme Council. I cannot forget, that in a late Popiſh Reign, the Advocates for Regal Supremacy and a diſpenſing Power in the Crown, could then tell us, * "that King *William* I. aſſerted this Uſage of his Anceſtors, that "none in his Dominions ſhould own the Pope, "but by his Command. And that therefore it "was not ſtrange, that during the Schiſm be"tween the Popes *Urban* and *Clement*, *William Ru*"*fus* claimed, as other Princes did, a Right to "declare to which Pope he and his Kingdom "would adhere. That Writer might have added, that it was ſo in the Reign of *Henry* II. and again, in the Reigns of King *Richard* II. and *Henry* IV. and *Henry* V.

But

* The King's Viſitat. Power aſſerted by Dr. *Nathaniel Johnſton*, 1688, 4to. p. 145, 146.

But hoping to write again ſhortly before your Lordſhip leaves the North, I commit this to your Pleaſure, and commend my ſelf to your Bleſſing and Prayers.

Your Lordſhip's

Moſt faithful humble Servant,

Octob. 22. 1716.

White Kennett.

(34)
233-46
NO
Turn